DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 815 FL 017 614

AUTHOR Cardenas, Karen Hardy
TITLE Foreign Language Programs and Foreign Language Program Administrators: Results of a Survey.
PUB DATE Oct 88
NOTE 32p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Role; College Faculty; *Department Heads; Educational Quality; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Language Enrollment; *Language Teachers; *Morale; *Program Development; Resource Allocation; Salary Wage Differentials; *Second Language Programs; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Salaries; Teacher Supply and Demand; Undergraduate Study

ABSTRACT

A survey of 1,027 chairpersons of foreign language departments in all Central States region two- and four-year colleges reveals encouraging news about the state of foreign language programs as perceived by administrators, but mixed results regarding issues affecting faculty and administrators. Respondents (N=304) expressed a high degree of satisfaction with their programs' quality, growth in enrollments and undergraduate and graduate majors, a projected upswing in faculty hiring, and the fairness of program resource allocation. Dissatisfaction was shown with levels of funding and faculty salary distribution. Most felt that market-driven salary formulas were not beneficial to their departments, and a smaller number felt that the formulas had lowered faculty morale; most, however, felt that faculty morale was generally good. Respondents seemed less concerned with salary differentials within their institutions than with differences between institutions. The findings concerning the department chair are less positive. While most administrators found satisfactions in their role, most felt they had increasing responsibility but less power. The greatest frustrations appear to be in lack of time for teaching and research, motivating unproductive faculty, accurately evaluating teaching, budgeting, locating and hiring part-time faculty, and handling faculty discontent. (Complete survey results are presented in tabular form at the end of the paper.) (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED299815

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Karen Hardy Cárdenas

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
K. Cardenas
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Foreign Language Programs and Foreign Language Program Administrators: Results of a Survey

As administrators in charge of foreign language programs, we are busy. Directing a department usually is only one aspect of our professional lives. During the years we serve as administrators we have occasional triumphs, a few disasters and the day-to-day challenge of overseeing a program and attempting to improve it. Unless we happen to actively seek out other foreign language administrators and share information with them, we may never know whether our reactions to our programs and to our own administrative responsibilities are at all typical of what administrators in positions similar to ours feel.

I had chaired the Department of Modern Languages at The University of South Dakota for almost two years when I attended the Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages in Milwaukee in the spring of 1986. I had attended Central States Conferences several times in my dozen years as a faculty member and had found them useful.

At this particular conference, however, I found myself listening to other administrators of foreign language departments. There was no discussion section organized specifically for foreign language administrators. As I attended a variety of meetings and social gatherings, however, I heard departmental administrators comment on the challenges, successes and problems of their particular programs.

At times I felt that the speaker could have been me. What he or she said sounded so much like something I had experienced. At other times, particularly when the speaker came from a very large institution or a small college in a large urban area, I found myself thinking that foreign language department administrators were a very diverse lot

FL 017614

with relatively little in common.

I left that conference determined to propose a special session for departmental administrators for the 1987 conference. I certainly did not want to use the session to hold forth on my very limited experiences as a department chair. Neither did I want to leave the session so unfocussed that it would degenerate into a pointless and interminable sharing of "war stories."

In order to provide some focus for the session and to seek information on what foreign language department administrators have in common, I decided to send a short questionnaire to the 1027 chairs of foreign language departments at all two-year and four-year institutions in the 17-state Central States region.[1] The 304 responses received at the time the results were tabulated reveal good news about the current state of language programs in the area as perceived by administrators. Regarding other issues affecting faculty and administrators, however, the results were somewhat mixed.[2] (The results of the survey are presented in their entirety at the end of this article.)

Those who responded to the questionnaire expressed a high degree of satisfaction with the quality of their programs. (For ease of reporting responses of "agree" and "agree strongly" have been collapsed into a single category as have "disagree" and "disagree strongly".) 89.5% of the respondents indicated that their departments offered quality undergraduate programs; 82.4% were equally positive about their graduate programs. (The percentage for graduate programs excludes those who marked "Not applicable" and those who gave no response.)

The responses to items regarding growth of departments were also very encouraging. 57.2% of those responding indicated that their

departments were attracting more undergraduate majors than five years ago; 25% indicated that they were not. 54.1% of those with graduate programs indicated an increase in the number of graduate majors over the same period; 27.6% saw no increase.

Growth was also evident in enrollment trends in general. 40.1% of the respondents agreed with the statement: "Enrollments in my department are growing significantly." 23.4% of those responding disagreed with the statement. When asked to react to the statement: "Enrollments in my department are declining significantly," only 6.6% agreed while 62.8% disagreed.

This growth is reflected in hiring projections for the next five years. 42.1% of the department administrators indicated that the increase in enrollments would necessitate the hiring of at least one new faculty member within the next five years. It is important to note, however, that 40.1% did not agree that more students would necessarily translate into more faculty.

If program growth is not so volatile that vast numbers of new faculty will be hired in the next five years, few of the respondents saw reductions in force as likely. Only 3% felt that declining enrollments in their departments would lead to the dismissal of a non-tenured faculty member; 78% indicated that they could not foresee such a dismissal. In the case of a tenured faculty member, only 1.3% agreed that a decline in enrollments might result in dismissal within a five-year period; 81.9% disagreed.

In recent years considerable attention has been given to the methods of allocating funds to the various programs in higher education. Although the survey did not ask chairs to specify what funding method was used at their institutions, dissatisfaction with the level of funding

for foreign language departments was evident. 51% of the respondents did not agree that the current level of funding for their departments was adequate. This contrasts with the 37.5% of respondents who felt that funding was adequate to meet their needs.

Despite the perceived inadequacy of funds, most respondents did not seem to feel that their departments had been dealt with unfairly. 55.3% indicated that the current funding level for their departments was equitable compared to other departments at the same institution; 31.2% did not agree. When comparing funding levels to those departments at other institutions, fewer respondents (29.7%) agreed that funding was equitable. Only 32.6% disagreed, however, only slightly more than the 30.9% who were uncertain.

If funds in general were seen as equitably distributed, salaries were not. The questionnaire contained three items related to the effect which the use of market-driven formulas had had on salaries in foreign language departments. Although almost a third of the respondents indicated that these items did not apply to their departments/institutions, the impact of tieing salaries of individuals or disciplines to what they could command in the marketplace was obviously being felt at many institutions.

When asked if the use of market-driven formulas had been financially beneficial to faculty members in their departments, 42.8% of foreign language department administrators said no and only 10.2% said yes. If one looks only at the number of respondents who either agreed, disagreed or were neutral (neither agreed nor disagreed) and eliminate those who checked "Not applicable" or who did not respond, 65.7% of these respondents indicated no financial benefit from market-driven formulas while 15.7% felt that market driven formulas had been beneficial

to their departments.

There was a similar level of concern with the fact that market-driven formulas had widened the salary gap between foreign language faculty and those in other disciplines. 43.8% of the respondents indicated that such formulas had widened the salary gap; 10.2% indicated that they had not. If those who marked "Not applicable" and those who gave no response are eliminated, the percentage of those who saw a widening salary gap increases to 63.6% while the percentage of those who did not increases to 14.8%.

It is obvious that market-driven formulas are affecting salaries in foreign languages. Although it will probably be years, perhaps decades, before their impact on the profession and on the whole of higher education is completely understood, there is reason for optimism. Market driven formulas are not seen as financially beneficial to faculty members in departments of foreign languages and the gap between these professionals and those in other disciplines is perceived as growing, but the impact on foreign language faculty morale is less disastrous than one might expect.

In contrast to the 42.8% who saw no financial benefit accruing to foreign language faculty from market-driven formulas and the 43.8% who perceived a widening salary gap, only 29.9% indicated that the use of market-driven formulas to determine salaries had had an adverse effect on the morale of faculty members in their departments. 18.1% indicated that it had not. Eliminating those respondents who gave no answer to this item or who indicated that it was not applicable raises these percentages to 44.2% and 26.7% respectively.

Despite the obvious concern with market-driven formulas and their effect on morale, 55.6% of the respondents indicated that faculty morale

in their departments was good compared to 19.1% who disagreed with this statement. 31.9% agreed that faculty morale was improving; 19.1% disagreed; and 42.1% neither agreed nor disagreed.

Insofar as salaries in general are concerned, the respondents seemed less concerned with inequities within their institutions than with how salaries in their department compared to those in foreign language departments at other institutions. 45.1% indicated that salaries in their departments were competitive with salaries in other departments in the institution. (39.1% said they were not.) This contrasts with the 34.2% of the respondents who felt that salaries in their departments were competitive with salaries in comparable departments at other institutions. (39.5% said that the salaries were not competitive.)

In analyzing those portions of the questionnaire which relate to programs and faculty, one sees an essentially positive picture: healthy programs, increasing enrollments, good faculty morale. The only cloud on the horizon would seem to be the current and future impact of market-driven formulas on foreign language faculty salaries.

The picture of the foreign language department Chair is somewhat less positive. The questionnaire items related to the role of the Chair were organized into two sections (Part III, Sections A and B). The first section dealt with the satisfactions of the Chair and with the responsibility of the Chair vs. her/his power.

It is clear from the results of the questionnaire that the role of Chair is not without its satisfactions. 71.1% of the respondents indicated that they found their role satisfying because they could have an effect on building a quality program. 73.5% agreed that being able to advise and direct students was one of the satisfactions of

being Chair.

Working with students and developing programs was more satisfying than working with faculty, although the results in this area were by no means negative. 52% of the respondents indicated that one of their satisfactions as Chair was being able to help the faculty improve their teaching. 48.7% were satisfied with their role in helping faculty develop in the area of research.

The satisfactions which chairing a language department brings are balanced, if not offset, by the responsibilities. 58.9% of those who responded to the questionnaire perceived their administrative role as giving them great responsibility but little power. 57.6% said that they were asked to assume more responsibility each year by upper-level administrators.

In order to assess the general contentment level of foreign language administrators, one might look at the responses to the eight items in Part III, Section A in their totality. The first four items attempt to identify areas of satisfaction. Only 81 of the 304 respondents (26.6%) indicated that all four areas were sources of satisfaction.

The last four items assess attitudes toward power and responsibility. One might expect a completely satisfied Chair to disagree with each and all of the last four statements. Only 24 of the respondents (7.9%) disagreed with all of the four statements.

The truly blissful Chair might have been expected to answer the first four items positively and the last four items negatively. If so, there is little bliss to be found among those of us who chair foreign language departments. Only nine of the respondents (3.0%) agreed with all of the first four items and disagreed with all of the last four. This need not be taken as a sign that we are a group of bitter

malcontents. It does tend to indicate, however, that few of us are tending perfect rose gardens with no thorns.

The second section of Part III was designed to discover which aspects of their jobs foreign language department Chairs found most frustrating. Although the way in which the section was designed may have seemed intended to evoke negative responses, the respondents had no difficulty indicating that a particular aspect of their job posed no problem.

Only six of the ten situations contained in Part III, Section B caused a significant degree of frustration for the administrators who responded to the questionnaire. In ascending order the six major sources of frustration were: time spent handling faculty complaints and squabbles (47.1%), locating and hiring part-time faculty when enrollments necessitate (48.3%), developing a fair and reasonable departmental budget (51.7%), accurately evaluating faculty teaching (54.3%), motivating unproductive faculty members (60.2%) and, most frustrating of all, lack of momentum in the Chair's own teaching and research because of time spent on responsibilities as Chair (73.7%).

It is important to note that, in the responses to most of these six items, the degree of frustration is mild. For example, only 26.7% of the 165 respondents who indicated some frustration over accurately evaluating faculty teaching felt that the problem was very frustrating.

The problems which the greatest number of administrators found frustrating were, however, also the sources of the highest level of frustration. Of those who indicated that motivating unproductive faculty members was frustrating 41.5% found this problem very frustrating. Of the 224 who indicated that their responsibilities as Chair had produced a frustrating lack of momentum in their own teaching and research,

111 or almost half (49.6%) said that the problem was very frustrating.

The responses to the survey were also analyzed to determine what effect various factors would have on those responses. The four factors or variables studied were the size of the institution, the size of the community in which the institution was located, whether the institution was public or private and whether there was collective bargaining at the institution. Differences significant at the $\geq .01$ level for at least one of the groups mentioned above were found on eighteen of the fifty questions in Parts II, III and IV.

In the cases of community size and collective bargaining, the items where $\geq .01$ levels of difference were found seemed to be either serendipity or explainable by other factors. For example, collective bargaining was seen as a significant factor in only one item. It is difficult to derive a meaningful conclusion from the fact that unionized and non-unionized institutions responded very differently to the statement: "Attrition in lower-division programs is a problem in my department."

Size of institution and type of institution (public vs. private) accounted for most of the items where a $\geq .01$ level of significance was found (fourteen for each). Since 87% of the private institutions indicated an enrollment of less than 5000, there is obviously some overlap between the two variables. It is size of institution which produces the most dramatic contrasts, however, and it is to these differences that we will now turn.

Several Chairs of language departments with whom I had corresponded or conversed had predicted that I would find significant differences between responses from smaller and larger institutions. However, there was a singular lack of unanimity on what these differences would be.

Chairs of departments at small institutions predicted that conditions would be shown to be worse there while Chairs of departments at large institutions were equally sure that the survey would serve to underscore their plight.

As it turned out, everyone was right. On balance, however, the smaller institutions would seem to be faring better. Listed below are the nine questionnaire items which show the most obvious differences favoring smaller institutions.

Questionnaire Item number	Statement	Response	General Total responses 304	Under 5,000 Total responses 121	Over 15,000 Total responses 80
Part II, 8	The current level of funding for my department is adequate to meet our needs.	Agree, Agree Strongly	37.5%	47.9%	22.5%
Part II, 9	The current level of funding for my department is equitable compared to other departments at the same institution.	Agree, Agree Strongly	55.3%	66.1%	38.8%
Part II, 10	The current level of funding for my department is adequate compared to comparable departments at other institutions.	Agree, Agree Strongly	29.7%	35.5%	21.3%
Part III A, 6	As a Chair I am asked to assume more responsibilities each year by upper-level administrators.	Agree, Agree Strongly	57.6%	51.2%	67.6%
Part IIIA, 8	I am in a no-win position between my faculty and upper-level administrators.	Agree, Agree Strongly	21.4%	16.6%	31.3%
Part IIIB, 5	(Indicate how you regard) time spent handling faculty complaints and squabbles.	Mildly Frustrating, Very Frustrating	47.1%	34.8%	58.8%

Questionnaire Item number	Statement	Response	General Total responses 304	Under 5,000 Total responses 121	Over 15,000 Total responses 80
Part IIIB, 6	(Indicate how you regard) time spent handling student complaints and squabbles.	Mildly Frustrating, Very Frustrating	34.8%	29.0%	43.8%
Part IIIB, 10	(Indicate how you regard) lack of momentum in Chair's own teaching and research because of time spent on responsibilities as Chair.	Mildly Frustrating, Very Frustrating	73.7%	64.4%	87.6%
Part IV, 3	Salaries for faculty members in my department are competitive with salaries in other departments in the institution.	Agree	45.1%	56.2%	27.5%

From these items one might well conclude that Chairs of departments in small institutions feel less pressure and consequently enjoy their role more. They also seem more satisfied with the economic status of their departments and are less likely to feel that their departments suffer in comparison with others.

There are three other items which underscore the relatively felicitous state of Chairs at small institutions. These items were not included with the previous list because of the large number of Chairs of departments at smaller institutions who indicated that the item was not applicable to them or to their institutions.

Questionnaire Item number	Statement	Response	General		Under 5,000		Over 15,000	
				Not Applicable		Not Applicable		Not Applicable
IIIB, I	(How do you regard) motivating unproductive faculty members.	Mildly or Very Frustrating	60.2%	15.8%	45.5%	19.8%	80.1%	10.0%
IV, 6	The use of market-driven formulas to determine salaries at my institution has widened the gap between salaries in my department and salaries in other departments.	Agree	43.8%	27.6%	30.6%	38.8%	58.8%	6.3%
IC, 7	The use of market-driven formulas to determine salaries has had an adverse effect on the morale of faculty members in my department.	Agree	29.9%	28.9%	14.9%	42.1%	43.8%	6.3%

The twelve items in these two sets seem to present a vision of problem-free smaller institions and crisis-ridden larger ones. As we have seen before, however, there are no situations which are free from all difficulties. The four items below reveal that small institions are not participating to the same degree in the growth which the foreign language discipline is experiencing generally. Enrollments at larger institutions seem to be experiencing a greater degree of growth and there are more plans to increase staff.

Questionnaire Item number	Statement	Response	General	Under 5,000	Over 15,000
IV, 8	Enrollments in my department are growing significantly.	Agree	40.1%	33.1%	56.3%
IV, 9	Enrollments in my department are declining significantly.	Agree	6.6%	9.1%	2.5%
IV, 11	Barring the unforeseen, we will add no new faculty members in my department in the next five years.	Agree	41.4%	53.7%	23.8%
IV, 12	Growth in enrollments in my department will necessitate hiring at least one new faculty member in the next five years.	Agree	42.1%	29.8%	61.3%

Institutional size would seem to be enabling in some respects and disabling in others. This is true for all institutions whether large or small. Whatever the strengths of an institution, they seem to have been purchased at the cost of other factors. Institutions which are experiencing growth appear to be very stressful places to work; Chairs at smaller institutions seem more content and in control but see less growth in their programs.

The survey of foreign language administrators indicates that there are reasons for satisfaction and for concern in our profession. The report has not commented on every item contained in the survey. The intent of the report was to highlight those results which were most significant. The reader should scan the questionnaire and its results to see how the respondents reacted to other items.

A survey can only obtain information. To the degree that it points to successes in our profession, we can rejoice. To the extent that the survey shows that conditions in our field are less than optimum, we should be challenged to ascertain why these conditions exist and to determine what must be done to change them.

NOTES

[1]The seventeen states included in the survey were: Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Wisconsin. The questionnaire was sent to administrators identified by the Modern Language Association.

[2]As one trained primarily in the analysis of literature, surveys are not my métier. Several of my colleagues at The University of South Dakota kindly gave their time and assistance to aid in the completion of this project. I wish to thank Bill Bergman of the School of Business and Marilyn Hadley of the School of Education for their assistance in preparing the survey. I also wish to thank David Holmes of the Computer Center and Jim Lewis of the Department of Communications for their assistance in interpreting the results of the questionnaire. Finally, I wish to thank Galen Hadley, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, for allocating the funds which made this survey possible.

Results of the Survey of
Central States Foreign Language
Program Administrators

Part I. The Institution

1. Approximate enrollment of institution

	Responses	Percentage
100-999	36	11.8%
1,000-4,999	85	28.0%
5,000-9,000	32	10.5%
10,000-14,999	17	5.6%
15,000-19,000	10	3.3%
Over 20,000	70	23.0%
No Response	54	17.8%

2. Size of community in which institution is located

1,000-4,999	14	4.6%
5,000-9,999	19	6.3%
10,000-14,999	23	7.6%
15,000-24,999	25	8.2%
25,000-49,999	28	9.2%
50,000-99,999	37	12.2%
Over 100,000	102	33.6%
No Response	56	18.4%

3. Type of institution

Public	149	49.0%
Private	100	32.9%
No Response	55	18.1%

4. Is there collective bargaining at your institution?

Yes	43	14.1%
No	203	66.8%
No Response	58	19.1%

Part II

Concerns of second language department Chairs.

1. The department I chair currently offers quality undergraduate programs.

	Responses	Percentage
Agree Strongly	141	46.4%
Agree	131	43.1%
Undecided	6	2.0%
Disagree	7	2.3%
Disagree Strongly	4	1.3%
Not Applicable	6	2.0%
No Response	9	3.0%

2. The department I chair currently offers quality graduate programs.

Agree Strongly	46	15.1%
Agree	43	14.1%
Undecided	6	2.0%
Disagree	11	3.6%
Disagree Strongly	2	0.7%
Not Applicable	187	61.5%
No Response	9	3.0%

3. The Department I chair currently staffs lower division undergraduate courses adequately.

Agree Strongly	95	31.3%
Agree	128	42.1%
Undecided	13	4.3%
Disagree	51	16.8%
Disagree Strongly	6	2.0%
Not Applicable	3	1.0%
No Response	8	2.6%

4. The department I chair currently staffs upper division undergraduate courses adequately.

Agree Strongly	85	28.0%
Agree	111	36.5%
Undecided	12	3.9%
Disagree	33	10.9%
Disagree Strongly	6	2.0%
Not Applicable	47	15.5%
No Response	10	3.3%

5. The department I chair currently staffs graduate courses adequately.

	Responses	Percentage
Agree Strongly	33	10.9%
Agree	43	14.1%
Undecided	4	1.3%
Disagree	22	7.2%
Disagree Strongly	2	0.7%
Not Applicable	191	62.8%
No Response	9	3.0%

6. Currently there are adequate job opportunities for undergraduate majors of my department.

Agree Strongly	23	7.6%
Agree	109	35.9%
Undecided	69	22.7%
Disagree	50	16.4%
Disagree Strongly	9	3.0%
Not Applicable	35	11.5%
No Response	9	3.0%

7. Currently there are adequate job opportunities for graduate majors of my department.

Agree Strongly	17	5.6%
Agree	54	17.8%
Undecided	20	6.6%
Disagree	16	5.3%
Disagree Strongly	4	1.3%
Not Applicable	184	60.5%
No Response	9	3.0%

8. The current level of funding for my department is adequate to to meet our needs.

Agree Strongly	18	5.9%
Agree	96	31.6%
Undecided	26	8.6%
Disagree	93	30.6%
Disagree Strongly	62	20.4%
Not Applicable	1	0.3%
No Response	8	2.6%

9. The current level of funding for my department is equitable compared to other departments at the same institution.

Agree Strongly	34	11.2%
Agree	134	44.1%
Undecided	31	10.2%
Disagree	56	18.4%
Disagree Strongly	39	12.8%
Not Applicable	2	0.7%
No Response	8	2.6%

10. The current level of funding for my department is equitable compared to comparable departments at other institutions.

	Responses	Percentage
Agree Strongly	19	6.3%
Agree	71	23.4%
Undecided	94	30.9%
Disagree	61	20.1%
Disagree Strongly	38	12.5%
Not Applicable	8	2.6%
No Response	13	4.3%

11. Faculty workload in my department is reasonable compared to other departments at the same institution.

Agree Strongly	51	16.8%
Agree	145	47.7%
Undecided	10	3.3%
Disagree	54	17.8%
Disagree Strongly	34	11.2%
Not Applicable	1	0.3%
No Response	9	3.0%

12. Faculty workload in my department is reasonable compared to comparable departments at other institutions.

Agree Strongly	31	10.2%
Agree	110	36.2%
Undecided	59	19.4%
Disagree	60	19.7%
Disagree Strongly	31	10.2%
Not Applicable	2	0.7%
No Response	11	3.6%

13. My department is attracting more undergraduate majors than five years ago.

Agree Strongly	69	22.7%
Agree	105	34.5%
Undecided	24	7.9%
Disagree	58	19.1%
Disagree Strongly	18	5.9%
Not Applicable	20	6.6%
No Response	10	3.3%

14. My department is attracting more graduate students than five years ago.

Agree Strongly	24	7.9%
Agree	35	11.5%
Undecided	10	3.3%
Disagree	30	9.9%
Disagree Strongly		
Not Applicable	195	64.1%
No Response	10	3.3%

Part III Section A

The Role of the Chair

1. I am satisfied with my role as Chair because I can have an effect on building a quality program.

	Responses	Percentage
Agree Strongly	76	25.0%
Agree	140	46.1%
Undecided	34	11.2%
Disagree	32	10.5%
Disagree Strongly	9	3.0%
Not Applicable	2	0.7%
No Response	11	3.6%

2. One of my satisfactions as Chair is being able to advise and direct students.

Agree Strongly	68	22.4%
Agree	155	51.1%
Undecided	16	5.3%
Disagree	30	9.9%
Disagree Strongly	3	1.0%
Not Applicable	23	7.6%
No Response	9	3.0%

3. One of my satisfactions as Chair is being able to help the faculty improve their teaching.

Agree Strongly	33	10.9%
Agree	125	41.1%
Undecided	62	20.4%
Disagree	45	14.8%
Disagree Strongly	8	2.6%
Not Applicable	22	7.2%
No Response	9	3.0%

4. One of my satisfactions as Chair is being able to help the faculty members develop in the area of research.

Agree Strongly	46	15.1%
Agree	102	33.6%
Undecided	41	13.5%
Disagree	43	14.1%
Disagree Strongly	12	3.9%
Not Applicable	51	16.8%
No Response	9	3.0%

5. I see the role of Chair as giving me great responsibility but little power.

	Responses	Percentage
Agree Strongly	77	25.3%
Agree	102	33.6%
Undecided	29	9.5%
Disagree	67	22.0%
Disagree Strongly	10	3.3%
Not Applicable	8	2.6%
No Response	11	3.6%

6. As a Chair I am asked to assume more responsibilities each year by upper-level administrators.

Agree Strongly	61	20.1%
Agree	114	37.5%
Undecided	36	11.8%
Disagree	68	22.4%
Disagree Strongly	10	3.3%
Not Applicable	6	2.0%
No Response	9	3.0%

7. I have very little power and my faculty are aware that my recommendations on issues which affect their future are only recommendations.

Agree Strongly	39	12.8%
Agree	87	28.6%
Undecided	42	13.8%
Disagree	87	28.6%
Disagree Strongly	33	10.9%
Not Applicable	7	2.3%
No Response	9	3.0%

8. I am in a no-win position between my faculty and upper-level administrators.

Agree Strongly	24	7.9%
Agree	41	13.5%
Undecided	45	14.8%
Disagree	108	35.5%
Disagree Strongly	62	20.4%
Not Applicable	15	4.9%
No Response	9	3.0%

Part III Section B

Indicate how you react to the following:

1. Motivating unproductive faculty members.

	Response	Percentage
Not Applicable	48	15.8%
No Problem	63	20.7%
Mildly Frustrating	107	35.2%
Very Frustrating	76	25.0%
No Response	10	3.3%

2. Attracting and keeping productive faculty members.

Not Applicable	30	9.9%
No Problem	148	48.7%
Mildly Frustrating	89	29.3%
Very Frustrating	26	8.6%
No Response	11	3.6%

3. Accurately evaluating faculty teaching.

Not Applicable	17	5.6%
No Problem	111	36.5%
Mildly Frustrating	121	39.8%
Very Frustrating	44	14.5%
No Response	11	3.6%

4. Accurately evaluating faculty research.

Not Applicable	79	26.0%
No Problem	138	45.4%
Mildly Frustrating	65	21.4%
Very Frustrating	10	3.3%
No Response	11	3.6%

5. Time spent handling faculty complaints and squabbles.

Not Applicable	21	6.9%
No Problem	134	44.1%
Mildly Frustrating	109	35.9%
Very Frustrating	34	11.2%
No Response	6	2.0%

6. Time spent handling student complaints and squabbles.

Not Applicable	7	2.3%
No Problem	184	60.5%
Mildly Frustrating	94	30.9%
Very Frustrating	12	3.9%
No Response	7	2.3%

7. Developing a fair and reasonable departmental budget.

	Responses	Percentage
Not Applicable	14	4.6%
No Problem	126	41.4%
Mildly Frustrating	106	34.9%
Very Frustrating	51	16.8%
No Response	7	2.3%

8. Developing a departmental teaching schedule satisfactory to faculty and administrators.

Not Applicable	7	2.3%
No Problem	175	57.6%
Mildly Frustrating	98	32.2%
Very Frustrating	18	5.9%
No Response	6	2.0%

9. Locating and hiring part-time faculty when enrollments necessitate.

Not Applicable	36	11.8%
No Problem	114	37.5%
Mildly Frustrating	101	33.2%
Very Frustrating	46	15.1%
No Response	7	2.3%

10. Lack of momentum in Chair's own teaching and research because of time spent on responsibilities as Chair.

Not Applicable	20	6.6%
No Problem	53	17.4%
Mildly Frustrating	113	37.2%
Very Frustrating	111	36.5%
No Response	7	2.3%

Part IV. Additional Concerns

1. Faculty morale in my department is good.

Agree	169	55.6%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	71	23.4%
Disagree	58	19.1%
Not Applicable	2	0.7%
No Response	4	1.3%

2. Faculty morale in my department is steadily improving.

Agree	97	31.9%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	128	42.1%
Disagree	58	19.1%
Not Applicable	13	4.3%
No Response	8	2.6%

3. Salaries for faculty members in my department are competitive with salaries in other departments in the institution.

	Responses	Percentage
Agree	137	45.1%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	35	11.5%
Disagree	119	39.1%
Not Applicable	7	2.3%
No Response	6	2.0%

4. Salaries for faculty members in my department are competitive with salaries in comparable departments at other institutions.

Agree	104	34.2%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	64	21.1%
Disagree	120	39.5%
Not Applicable	8	2.6%
No Response	8	2.6%

5. The use of market-driven formulas to determine salaries (i.e., those which tie salaries of individuals or disciplines to the amount they could command in the market place) has been financially beneficial to members of my department.

Agree	31	10.2%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	37	12.2%
Disagree	130	42.8%
Not Applicable	98	32.2%
No Response	8	2.6%

6. The use of market-driven formulas to determine salaries at my institution has widened the gap between salaries in my department and salaries in other departments.

Agree	133	43.8%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	45	14.8%
Disagree	31	10.2%
Not Applicable	84	27.6%
No Response	11	3.6%

7. The use of market-driven formulas to determine salaries has had an adverse effect on the morale of faculty members in my department.

Agree	91	29.9%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	60	19.7%
Disagree	55	18.1%
Not Applicable	88	28.9%
No Response	10	3.3%

8. Enrollments in my department are growing significantly.

	Responses	Percentage
Agree	122	40.1%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	104	34.2%
Disagree	71	23.4%
Not Applicable	2	0.7%
No Response	5	1.6%

9. Enrollments in my department are declining significantly.

Agree	20	6.6%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	79	26.0%
Disagree	191	62.8%
Not Applicable	5	1.6%
No Response	9	3.0%

10. Attrition in lower-division programs is a problem in my department.

Agree	112	36.8%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	58	19.1%
Disagree	117	38.5%
Not Applicable	12	3.9%
No Response	5	1.6%

11. Barring the unforeseen, we will add no new faculty members in my department in the next five years.

Agree	126	41.4%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	36	11.8%
Disagree	134	44.1%
Not Applicable	1	0.3%
No Response	7	2.3%

12. Growth in enrollments in my department will necessitate hiring at least one new faculty member in the next five years.

Agree	128	42.1%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	38	12.5%
Disagree	122	40.1%
Not Applicable	9	3.0%
No Response	7	2.3%

13. Declining enrollments in my department will necessitate dismissing at least one non-tenured faculty member in the next five years.

	Responses	Percentage
Agree	9	3.0%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	19	6.3%
Disagree	237	78.0%
Not Applicable	32	10.5%
No Response	7	2.3%

14. Declining enrollments in my department will necessitate dismissing at least one tenured faculty member in the next five years.

Agree	4	1.3%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	17	5.6%
Disagree	249	81.9%
Not Applicable	27	8.9%
No Response	7	2.3%

15. My department relies extensively on part-time and/or non-tenure-track faculty.

Agree	102	33.6%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	24	7.9%
Disagree	160	52.6%
Not Applicable	12	3.9%
No Response	6	2.0%

16. My department relies excessively on part-time and/or non-tenure-track faculty.

Agree	57	18.8%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	32	10.5%
Disagree	190	62.5%
Not Applicable	10	3.3%
No Response	15	4.9%

17. There is too much emphasis on teaching in the tenure/promotion process at my institution.

Agree	11	3.6%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	34	11.2%
Disagree	239	78.6%
Not Applicable	15	4.9%
No Response	5	1.6%

18. There is too much emphasis on research and publication in the tenure/promotion process at my institution.

	Responses	Percentage
Agree	47	15.5%
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	44	14.5%
Disagree	177	58.2%
Not Applicable	31	10.2%
No Response	5	1.6%